

Message

From: Compher, Michael [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=E258CB856E3D4AE6BACCA7FA48CA827A-MCOMPHER]
Sent: 3/16/2017 9:49:27 PM
To: Bloomberg, David E. [David.Bloomberg@Illinois.gov]
CC: chris.price@illinois.gov
Subject: RE: special data request

David and Chris,

Thanks for your response. On Monday, we are planning to look over your response as well as responses we've received from other States on Monday. I'll let you know if any additional questions come up.

Michael Compher
Chief, Air Monitoring and Analysis Section
Region 5 Air and Radiation Division
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Phone: 312-886-5745

From: Bloomberg, David E. [mailto:David.Bloomberg@Illinois.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, March 15, 2017 4:15 PM
To: Compher, Michael <compher.michael@epa.gov>
Cc: chris.price@illinois.gov
Subject: RE: special data request

Michael,

Below is our response to your request. We did have a little difficulty in deciding exactly where to draw the line on determining what you wanted. The difference between why the 7% threshold was exceeded can be either a monitor malfunction or simply that the monitor has drifted. We have autocheck QCs above 7% that were simple monitor malfunctions – for example if a pump fails. In such a case, the percentage is higher than 7% but it's not due to the autocheck or QC check being that far off, it is due to the monitor itself failing. On the other hand, there could be checks that are greater than 7% with no monitor malfunctions, but we did not find any of these.

So we did our best in going through the nightly autospans/precisions and picked out some that were greater than 7%. It looks like all of these were due to other known issues that caused us to null data. There were others that were greater than 7% but a transfer standard check would confirm it was not a monitor problem but that the drierite needed to be replaced or the internal generator was the issue, for example – we left those out of the list below. In the end, we were really only able to find actual transfer standard checks that were above the 7.1% threshold but not the 7% threshold due to the extra decimal now included in the validation tables (these are noted first below).

So here is our best shot at giving what you've requested. Please let us know if you have questions or need further discussion.

Transfer Standard Checks

Side ID	Site Name	Date	Notes
17-031-7002	Evanston	5/16/16	7.1% Check under 7% threshold; not under new < 7.1% threshold; in AQS; data not invalidated
17-161-3002	Rock Island	6/28/16	7.1% Check under 7% threshold; not under new < 7.1% threshold; in AQS; data not invalidated

*there were other transfer standard precision checks that were completed outside of the 7% threshold that was found to be an issue with the transfer standard.

Sample of Auto Checks

Side ID	Site Name	Data affected	Notes
17-097-1007	Zion	3/18/14 to 3/27/14	Low Flow; data invalid
17-161-3002	Rock Island	7/30/14 to 8/8/14	Flow issue; data invalid
17-201-2001	Loves Park	5/16/14 to 5/20/14	Leak at filter; data invalid
17-031-3103	Schiller Park	3/19/14 to 3/21/14	Reseated filter; data invalid
17-111-0001	Cary	9/13/15 to 9/16/15	Low flow; data invalid
17-019-0007	Thomasboro	5/31/15 to 6/3/15	Pump issue, data invalid
17-119-1009	Maryville	5/21/16 to 6/3/16	Diaphragm replaced, data invalid
17-089-0005	Elgin	5/15/16 to 5/24/16	Diaphragm replaced, data invalid
17-083-1001	Jerseyville	4/13/16 to 4/28/16	Monitor errors, data invalid
17-161-3002	Rock Island	8/8/16 to 8/11/16	Flow issue, data invalid
17-031-7002	Evanston	9/5/16 to 9/9/16	Diaphragm replaced, data invalid
17-201-2001	Loves Park	9/3/16 to 9/8/16	Sample line issue, data invalid
17-119-3007	Wood River	9/1/16 to 9/7/16	Diaphragm replaced, data invalid

From: Compber, Michael [<mailto:compber.michael@epa.gov>]

Sent: Monday, March 13, 2017 3:37 PM

To: kilmers@michigan.gov; 'Strassman, Rick (MPCA)'; Bloomberg, David E.; 'Zeiler, Dick'; paul.koval@epa.ohio.gov; 'Praedel, Katie - DNR'

Subject: [External] special data request

State Monitoring Managers,

As all of you know, EPA is looking closely at ozone data. Discussions within EPA have shifted from zero-corrections to the implementation of the ozone data validation templates, specifically, the 7% criteria for QC checks. After review of all of your QAPPs, we've confirmed that all R5 States have 7% listed as the QC check acceptance criteria (that's great, for R5!). Next, we are looking at AQS to identify instances when you have ozone QC checks above/below 7%, as well as the ambient data collected (invalidated or not) prior to that check. However, we cannot identify in AQS any checks that exceeded 7% that were invalidated and therefore not reported to AQS. For those of you less familiar with AQS, null ambient data in AQS often includes a null data flag indicating a rationale for the absence of a value. QC data doesn't have this function and therefore there is no indication that a QC check was attempted but for some reason was determined to be invalid and not reported to AQS.

I am requesting that each of you query your internal data systems and provide a list (include the site id and date) of all ozone QC checks that exceeded 7% in 2014 – 2016. Some of these checks may have been reported to AQS, others may not have been reported due to implementation of your QAPPs' validation criteria. If you have local agency or tribal agencies that report through the State as part of a 'State-led' PQAQ, please include those monitoring organization's results as well. If possible, please provide this by COB Friday, March 13th. If this deadline poses challenges, please reply back to let me know when I could reasonably expect a response from you. Once R5 has this information, we will be closely looking over it and will follow-up if any additional questions emerge.

Thanks for your attention and let me know if you have any questions,

- Michael

Michael Compber
Chief, Air Monitoring and Analysis Section

Region 5 Air and Radiation Division
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Phone: 312-886-5745

State of Illinois - CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: The information contained in this communication is confidential, may be attorney-client privileged or attorney work product, may constitute inside information or internal deliberative staff communication, and is intended only for the use of the addressee. Unauthorized use, disclosure or copying of this communication or any part thereof is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you have received this communication in error, please notify the sender immediately by return e-mail and destroy this communication and all copies thereof, including all attachments. Receipt by an unintended recipient does not waive attorney-client privilege, attorney work product privilege, or any other exemption from disclosure.